

1 William E. Peterson (Nevada SBN 1528)
2 Janine C. Prupas (Nevada SBN 9156)
3 SNELL & WILMER
4 50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 510
5 Reno, Nevada 89501
6 Telephone: (775) 785-5440
7 Facsimile: (775) 785-5441
8 wpeterson@swlaw.com
9 jprupas@swlaw.com

10 Reginald J. Hill (pro hac vice pending)
11 Michael G. Babbitt (pro hac vice pending)
12 JENNER & BLOCK LLP
13 353 North Clark
14 Chicago, Illinois 60654
15 Telephone: (312) 222-9350
16 Facsimile: (312) 527-0484
17 rhill@jenner.com
18 mbabbitt@jenner.com

19 Attorneys for Raritan Inc. (a New Jersey
20 corporation), and Raritan Americas, Inc.,
21 (a New Jersey corporation)

22 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
23 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

24 SERVER TECHNOLOGY, INC. (a Nevada
25 corporation),

26 Plaintiff,

vs.

RARITAN INC., a New Jersey corporation and
RARITAN AMERICAS, INC., a New Jersey
corporation

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:15-CV-00330-MMD-WGC

**UNOPPOSED MOTION TO
RESCHEDULE THE DATE
FOR DEFENDANTS TO
ANSWER THE COMPLAINT**

1 Defendants Raritan Inc. and Raritan Americas, Inc. (collectively and together,
2 “Defendants”) respectfully move this Court to extend the date for Defendants to answer the
3 Complaint by 30 days to September 3, 2015. Defendants are authorized to represent that
4 Plaintiff Server Technology, Inc. (“STI”) agrees to this extension. A Proposed Order is attached
5 as Exhibit A.

6 In support of this motion, Defendants state as follows:

7 1. On June 22, 2015, STI filed the Complaint in this case against Defendants. On
8 June 29, 2015, STI filed an Amended Complaint in this case against Defendants. A summons
9 was issued as to Raritan Inc. on June 23, 2015 and returned on July 22, 2015. A summons was
10 issued as to Raritan Americas, Inc. on June 23, 2015 and returned on July 22, 2015. The date for
11 Defendants to answer the Complaint is originally set for August 4, 2015.

12 2. The parties subsequently met and conferred regarding the case schedule.
13 Thereafter, counsel for STI agreed to a 30-day extension of time for Defendants to answer or
14 otherwise plead in response to the Complaint.

15 3. Accordingly, the parties are in agreement that Defendants should have until and
16 including September 3, 2015 to answer or otherwise plead in response to the Complaint.
17 September 3, 2015 is thirty (30) days from August 4, 2015, the date on which Defendants’
18 answer was originally due in this case.

19 4. This is the first request for an extension of time with respect to STI’s Amended
20 Complaint.

21 5. A Proposed Order granting this 30-day extension is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

22 For those reasons, Defendants respectfully request that the Court enter the Proposed
23 Order, rescheduling the date for Defendants to answer or otherwise plead in response to the
24 Complaint to September 3, 2015.

25 *(signatures on following page)*
26

DATED: August 4, 2015

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Janine C. Prupas
William E. Peterson (Nevada SBN 1528)
Janine C. Prupas (Nevada SBN 9156)
SNELL & WILMER
50 W. Liberty Street, Suite 510
Reno, Nevada 89501
Telephone: (775) 785-5440
Fax: (775) 785-5441
wpeterson@swlaw.com
jprupas@swlaw.com

Reginald J. Hill (pro hac vice pending)
Michael G. Babbitt (pro hac vice pending)
JENNER & BLOCK LLP
353 N. Clark Street
Chicago, Illinois 60654
Telephone: (312) 923-2738
Fax: (312) 840-7738
rhill@jenner.com
mbabbitt@jenner.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Raritan Inc. and
Raritan Americas, Inc.*

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing was filed on August 4, 2015
3 with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system which will send a notice of filing to all
4 counsel of record.

5 */s/ Janine C. Prupas* _____
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

2 SERVER TECHNOLOGY, INC. (a Nevada
3 corporation),

4 Plaintiff,

5 vs.

6 RARITAN INC., a New Jersey corporation and
7 RARITAN AMERICAS, INC., a New Jersey
corporation

8 Defendants.

9
Case No.: 3:15-CV-00330-MMD-WGC


10
**UNOPPOSED MOTION TO
RESCHEDULE THE DATE
FOR DEFENDANTS TO
ANSWER THE COMPLAINT**

11
PROPOSED ORDER OF THE COURT

12 Upon review of the Unopposed Motion to Reschedule The Date For Defendants to
13 Answer the Complaint (the “Motion”), the Court hereby GRANTS the Motion, and orders that
14 the date for Defendants to answer the Complaint is rescheduled to September 3, 2015.

15
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: August 4, 2015



18
19 MIRANDA M. DU
U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

20
21
22
23
24
25
26